



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/495,268	01/31/2000	Michael O. Cimini	13D13211	4650

29399 7590 09/30/2003

JOHN S. BEULICK  
C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE  
SUITE 2600  
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER

WOO, ISAAC M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/495,268

Applicant(s)

CIMINI ET AL.

Examiner

Isaac M Woo

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to Applicant's amendments, filed on July 01, 2003 have been considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The pending claims are 1-20.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,827) in view of Buzsaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,422).

With respect to claim 1, Raz discloses, the plurality of clients (Fig. 1, FIG. 2, FIG. 3, col. 1, lines 37-51, col. 3, lines 27-38), each the client comprising a plurality of user interface classes (object oriented GUI with Java applet class, FIG. 3, FIG. 5A, col. 5, lines 24-67 to col. 6, lines 1-54, col. 7, lines 25-60) and at least one class that provides access to a database (8, information & multimedia databases, FIG. 1, FIG. 2, FIG. 3), see (col. 1, lines 37-67, col. 6, lines 64-67 to col. 7, lines 1-2, col. 8, lines 6-12); server

(18, FIG. 2, FIG. 3) comprising a plurality of servlets, at least some of the servlets providing at least one of a database (Java applet on server side, FIG. 2, FIG. 3, col. 8, lines 36-65, 8, information & multimedia databases, FIG. 1) and server access capability to each client database is accessed by client via server, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 1, lines 38-67); database comprising a plurality of tables, at least one table of the tables (FIG. 10, FIG. 11, FIG. 12, col. 14, lines 1-67) comprising at least meta-data (table 1, FIG. 10, table 1, FIG. 11, col. 14, lines 1-29, FIG. 8, col. 5, lines 61-67 to col. 6, lines 1-8) defined by a user (col. 13, lines 40-50, col. 6, lines 46-67 to col. 7, lines 1-24, col. 13, lines 41-51). Raz discloses the database comprising tables (FIG. 10, FIG. 11, FIG. 12, col. 14, lines 1-67). Raz does not explicitly disclose the database table comprising at least one error proofing example. However, Buzsaki discloses the database table comprising at least one error encountered column (540, FIG. 5, col. 8, lines 13-61), which teaches to identify errors encountered during work flow activity and provide troubleshooting information to correct error, which is one of error proofing example provided by Buzsaki. Therefore, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the system of Raz by the system of Buzsaki to include the database table comprising at least one error proofing example to provide the error proofing information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the system of Raz with the system of Buzsak for troubleshooting that provides error detecting or identification, and also provides solution information for the error in computer system, which is useful for error corrections (error proofing) in computer system.

With respect to claim 2, Raz discloses that each user interface classes comprises at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input, see (NT work station with web GUI as client user, FIG. 2, col.10, lines 27-67 to col. 11, lines 1-15).

With respect to claim 3, Raz discloses that one of the user interface classes constructs and displays a menu of web pages that user can view, see (NT work station with web GUI, col.10, lines 27-67 to col. 11, lines 1-15).

With respect to claim 4, Raz discloses that one of the user interface classes initializes and displays forms, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 5A, col. 5, lines 24-67 to col. 6, lines 1-54, col. 7, lines 25-60).

With respect to claims 5 and 17, Raz discloses that the class that provides access to the database formats SQL statements and invokes request to servlets in the server that provide database access, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 5A, col. 5, lines 24-67 to col. 6, lines 1-54, col. 7, lines 25-60).

With respect to claim 6, Raz discloses that the server (18, FIG. 1, FIG. 2, FIG. 3) comprises servlets (Java applet on server side, FIG. 2, FIG. 3, col. 8, lines 36-65) for

database queries and updating, uploading a document and updating the database, downloading a document and extracting user permissions from the database, see (FIG. 3, col. 1, lines 38-67).

With respect to claims 7, 8 and 9, Raz discloses that one of the tables stores process (FIG. 10, FIG. 11, FIG. 12, col. 14, lines 1-67) which an error proofing example applies and failure modes associated with an error proofing example, part families and solution stage, (Note: disclosed system can provide information to user from client by accessing server database, the failure modes associated with an error proofing example, part families and solution stage, are one of the information type).

With respect to claim 10, Raz discloses that one of the tables data identifying users of the error proofing web site, see (col. 7, lines 26-67 to col. 8, lines 1-35).

With respect to claim 11, Raz discloses that one of the tables stores textual data relating to the error proofing example, see (col. 13, lines 8-51).

With respect to claim 12, Raz discloses that one of the tables stores a principle and related strategy that are associated with an error proofing example, see (FIG. 10, FIG. 11, FIG. 12, col. 14, lines 1-67, Note: disclosed system can provide information to user from client by accessing server database, a principle and related strategy that are associated with an error proofing example, are one of the information type).

With respect to claim 13, Raz disclose the system including a plurality of clients including a plurality of user interface classes (object oriented GUI with Java applet class, FIG. 3, FIG. 5A, col. 5, lines 24-67 to col. 6, lines 1-54, col. 7, lines 25-60), a server including a plurality of servlets (Java applet on server side, FIG. 2, FIG. 3, col. 8, lines 36-65), and a database including of tables (FIG. 1, FIG. 2, FIG. 3); using at least one interface class to provide access to a database, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 1, lines 38-67); using at least some of the servlets to provide at least one of the database (object oriented GUI with Java applet class, FIG. 3, FIG. 5A, col. 5, lines 24-67 to col. 6, lines 1-54, col. 7, lines 25-60) and server access to capability to a client, see (object oriented GUI with Java applet class, FIG. 3, FIG. 5A, col. 5, lines 24-67 to col. 6, lines 1-54, col. 7, lines 25-60, col. 1, lines 38-67); accessing a table, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 3, col. 1, lines 38-67). Raz does not explicitly disclose choosing error proofing technique to fit given application. However, Buzsaki discloses the database table comprising at least one error encountered column (540, FIG. 5, col. 8, lines 13-61), which teaches to identify errors encountered during work flow activity and provide troubleshooting information to correct the errors to given application, which is one of error proofing example provided by Buzsaki for troubleshooting for given application when error encountered. Therefore, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the system of Raz by the system of Buzsaki to include choosing error proofing technique to fit given application. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the system of Raz with

the system of Buzsak for troubleshooting that provides an error detecting or identification, and also provides solution information for the error detected to correct, which is useful for error corrections (error proofing) in computer system application.

With respect to claim 14, Raz discloses that at least one interface class to provide access to a database, providing at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input, see (NT work station with GUI as client user, FIG. 2, col.10, lines 27-67 to col. 11, lines 1-15).

With respect to claim 15, Raz discloses that the providing at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input comprises the constructing and displaying a menu of web pages that a user can view, see (NT work station with web GUI, col.10, lines 27-67 to col. 11, lines 1-15).

With respect to claim 16, Raz discloses that the providing at least tow visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input comprises the initializing and displaying forms, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 5A, col. 5, lines 24-67 to col. 6, lines 1-54, col. 7, lines 25-60).

With respect to claim 17, Raz discloses that the class that provides access to the database formats SQL statements and invokes request to servlets in the server that



provide database access, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 5A, col. 5, lines 24-67 to col. 6, lines 1-54, col. 7, lines 25-60).

With respect to claim 18, Raz discloses that querying database, uploading a document and updating the database, and downloading a document and extracting user permission from the database, see (FIG. 3, col. 1, lines 38-67).

With respect to claim 19, Raz discloses that the storing processes in the table to which an error proofing example applies, see (FIG. 10, FIG. 11, FIG. 12, col. 14, lines 1-67).

Claim 20 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given claims above in claims 7-12.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. In response to Applicant's remarks filed on July 01, 2003, the following factual argument points are noted:

The combination of Raz and Buzsaki does not describe nor suggest the system that includes a plurality of clients, a server has a plurality of servlets, servlet providing database, database has a plurality of tables and meta-data the database table provides "at least one error proofing example (the definitions of "error proofing example" is an

example of the forms of documents, defined from specification from on page 1, lines 4-5 (document), on page 1, lines 15-22, on page 2, lines 8-12, on page 4, lines 20-21 (web-based actual document), on page 3, lines 5-8)" from page No. 9, on page 4 for claim 1 and for claim 13 (page 5, lines 9-17).

Response: Raz discloses the a plurality of clients, see (col.1, lines 38-51, FIG.1) and server, see (col.1, lines 38-51, FIG.1) has a plurality of servelts, see (col.8, lines 36-65), servlet providing database, see (FIG.10, FIG. 11), database has a plurality of tables, see (FIG.10, FIG. 11) and meta-data, see (table of 1 FIG.10, col. 14, lines 1-29, FIG. 8, col. 5, lines 61-67 to col. 6, lines 1-8). The "error proofing example" is an error related information form of actual document as defined from specification. Thus, the error proofing example is an information. Buzsaki discloses the database table (FIG. 5, col. 8, lines 12-61) stores the error related information and notifies information, see (col. 8, lines 12-61). Buzsaki discloses the error column is used to identify error encountered and this information is used for troubleshooting, see (col. 8, lines 12-61). The error column from database table provides troubleshooting information. Thus, Buzsaki teaches the error proofing example.

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2172


TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac M Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-0081. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

IMW  
September 22, 2003

  
SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER